UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

TERRY R. SWALLEY,) CASE NO. 1:15 CV 934
Plaintiff,	JUDGE DONALD C. NUGENT
v.) MEMORANDUM OF OPINION AND ORDER
ARIANA E. TARIGHATI,	
Defendant.	}

On May 12, 2015, Plaintiff pro se Terry Swalley filed this in forma pauperis action against Defendant Attorney Ariana E. Tarighati. While the allegations of the Complaint are unclear, Plaintiff appears to allege that Defendant misled him about the amount of a court settlement in a civil case she filed on his behalf. For the reasons stated below, this action is dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e).

Although pro se pleadings are liberally construed, Boag v. MacDougall, 454 U.S. 364, 365 (1982) (per curiam); Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520 (1972), the district court is required to dismiss an action under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) if it fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, or if it lacks an arguable basis in law or fact. Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); Lawler v. Marshall, 898 F.2d 1196 (6th Cir. 1990); Sistrunk v. City of Strongsville, 99 F.3d 194, 197 (6th Cir. 1996).

Even construing the Complaint liberally, there are no allegations suggesting a proper basis for this Court's jurisdiction. Plaintiff does not invoke a federal statute in support of his claim, and there are no allegations of diversity of citizenship. Further, even if there were diversity of citizenship, the amount of potential damages does not fall within the jurisdictional minimum necessary to support such a claim. See, 28 U.S.C. § 1332. This action is therefore appropriately subject to summary dismissal. *Lowe v. Hustetler*, No. 89-5996, 1990 WL 66822 (6th Cir. May 21, 1990).

Accordingly, this action is dismissed under section 1915(e). Further, the Court certifies, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3), that an appeal from this decision could not be taken in good faith.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DONALD C. NUGENT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGI